

RELEASE 10.0

-----Original Message-----

From: Judith Schultz [SMTP:jmschu4@qwest.com]
Sent: Monday, July 29, 2002 9:50 AM
To: Clauson, Karen L.
Cc: 'Matt White'; 'Jim Maher'; 'Bahner, Terry'; 'Balvin, Liz'; 'Crain, Andrew'; 'Dixon, Tom'; 'Doberneck, Megan'; 'Green, Wendy'; 'Gunderson, Peder'; 'Heline, Mark'; 'Hydock, Mike'; 'Jacobs, Teresa'; 'Jennings-Fader, Mana'; 'Lee, Judy'; 'Lees, Marcia'; 'Littler, Bill'; 'McDaniel, Paul'; 'Menezes, Mitch'; 'Nolan, Laurel'; 'Osborne-Miller, Donna'; 'Powers, F. Lynne'; 'Prescott, Deborah'; 'Priday, Tom'; 'Quintana, Becky'; 'Rossi, Matt'; 'Routh, Mark'; 'Spence, Barbara'; 'Stichter, Kathleen L.'; 'Thompson, Jeffery'; 'Travis, Susan'; 'VanMeter, Sharon'; 'Woodcock, Beth'; 'Zulevic, Mike'; 'Baum, Carol'; 'Susan Lorence'; 'Hines, LeiLani'; 'Terry Wicks'; 'Benventano, Dan'; 'john_sheehan@frontiercorp.com'; 'Wayne Hart'; Johnson, Bonnie J.
Subject: Re: Compliance issue: Release 10.0 issue

Karen,

Thank you for your memo. I have forwarded your concerns to the appropriate Qwest personnel. As you are aware, these issues are being worked on. I will be happy to accept and address any concerns you or any other CLECs have regarding Qwest's compliance with the CMP on an informal basis. I do not think it is necessary to develop a process.

Judy

-----Original Message-----

From: Clauson, Karen L.
Sent: Thursday, July 25, 2002 9:10 PM
To: 'Judith Schultz'
Cc: 'Matt White'; 'Jim Maher'; 'Bahner, Terry'; 'Balvin, Liz'; 'Crain, Andrew'; 'Dixon, Tom'; 'Doberneck, Megan'; 'Green, Wendy'; 'Gunderson, Peder'; 'Heline, Mark'; 'Hydock, Mike'; 'Jacobs, Teresa'; 'Jennings-Fader, Mana'; 'Lee, Judy'; 'Lees, Marcia'; 'Littler, Bill'; 'McDaniel, Paul'; 'Menezes, Mitch'; 'Nolan, Laurel'; 'Osborne-Miller, Donna'; 'Powers, F. Lynne'; 'Prescott, Deborah'; 'Priday, Tom'; 'Quintana, Becky'; 'Rossi, Matt'; 'Routh, Mark'; 'Spence, Barbara'; 'Stichter, Kathleen L.'; 'Thompson, Jeffery'; 'Travis, Susan'; 'VanMeter, Sharon'; 'Woodcock, Beth'; 'Zulevic, Mike'; 'Baum, Carol'; 'Susan Lorence'; 'Hines, LeiLani'; 'Terry Wicks'; 'Benventano, Dan'; 'john_sheehan@frontiercorp.com'; 'Wayne Hart'; Johnson, Bonnie J.; Powers, F. Lynne; Stichter, Kathleen L.
Subject: Compliance issue: Release 10.0 issue

Judy:

Below is a description of an issue that Eschelon believes is an example of non-compliance with CMP procedures. I believe this was discussed at the last CMP meeting and Qwest indicated that it disagreed with Eschelon's assessment that this should have been a Level 1 change. As I understand it, Qwest's position is that it was a Level 2. (Please let me know if I misunderstood.) In either case (Level 1 or 2), however, the status intervals and other procedures were not followed. Does Qwest plan to provide an analysis of this issue beyond the discussion at the CMP meeting? How are such issues being tracked?

What is the process that Qwest is following for investigating and reporting to CLEC's on compliance concerns and for correcting issues when found? Is this process sufficiently documented (and, if so, where?). I have not received responses to my earlier emails regarding compliance issues. Perhaps we need intervals and a procedure for this.

Please let us know how this and the other issues we contacted you about are being handled and when we will receive responses.

Thank you,
Karen

Qwest has a documented process regarding how to submit CLEC-to-CLEC orders electronically. After the 10.0 Release on June 17, 2002, however, Eschelon could not submit electronically CLEC-to-CLEC orders following that documented process, or at all when the circuit identification numbers were not populated in IMA. When trying to do so, Eschelon receives various error messages (such as cannot find Customer Service Record, "CSR"). The error messages are up-front edits, so Eschelon was not allowed to proceed with the order. Eschelon was not informed in advance of any change in Release 10.0 that should have caused this result. Qwest told Eschelon that a third party system change caused the problem due to edits in one system that were not in the other. The practical problem confronting Eschelon and other CLECs was that due dates provided to end-user customers could be missed because Qwest's Release has prevented CLECs from relying on the documented process and placing CLEC-to-CLEC orders.

Eschelon submitted its first ticket with Qwest regarding this issue on June 21, 2002. Eschelon escalated the issue to its Qwest senior service manager and a Qwest process specialist, but they became unavailable while the issue remained unresolved. Several days went by with no update from Qwest. This failure to provide status updates violated the CMP production support process that is supposed to be in place. On July 1, 2002, Eschelon asked Qwest to correct the problem in IMA-GUI by the end of the day. Qwest did not correct the problem. On July 2, 2002, Qwest distributed an Event Notification (for Ticket Number 5970408) that states: "Work Around: IMA will remove the edit for AN placeholder of 000-000-0000-000 being invalid. Until fix is in place the LSR should be manually submitted. See URL: www.qwest.com/wholesale/clecs/escalations.html for contact information and/or faxing in your request." Eschelon does not know why Qwest waited until July 2, 2002, to distribute an event notification related to this issue, when Eschelon and Allegiance Telecom both submitted tickets on June 21, 2002. Eschelon informed Qwest that the work around identified in the event notification is unacceptable to Eschelon. Manually faxing orders to Qwest would introduce the increased likelihood of error and all of the other problems associated with faxes. Eschelon also told Qwest that the ticket severity level should appropriately be level 1, not level 3. The severity level affects the status notification intervals and other procedures that should have been, but were not, applied in this situation. Although the particular change preventing CLEC-to-CLEC orders has been corrected, the process non-compliance issue remains a concern.

Karen L. Clauson
Director of Interconnection
[REDACTED]

COPPER AVAILABILITY/UNANNOUNCED QWEST TECHNICIAN VISITS

-----Original Message-----

From: Clauson, Karen L.
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2002 11:03 AM
To: 'Schultz, Judy'
Cc: 'Matt White'; 'Jim Maher'; 'Bahner, Terry'; 'Balvin, Liz'; Clauson, Karen L.; 'Crain, Andrew'; 'Dixon, Tom'; 'Doberneck, Megan'; 'Green, Wendy'; 'Gunderson, Peder'; 'Helene, Mark'; 'Hydock, Mike'; 'Jacobs, Teresa'; 'Jennings-Fader, Mana'; 'Lee, Judy'; 'Lees, Marcia'; 'Littler, Bill'; 'McDaniel, Paul'; 'Menezes, Mitch'; 'Nolan, Laurel'; 'Osborne-Miller, Donna'; Powers, F. Lynne; 'Prescott, Deborah'; 'Priday, Tom'; 'Quintana, Becky'; 'Rossi, Matt'; 'Routh, Mark'; 'Spence, Barbara'; Stichter, Kathleen L.; 'Thompson, Jeffery'; 'Travis, Susan'; 'VanMeter, Sharon'; 'Woodcock, Beth'; 'Zulevic, Mike'; 'Baum, Carol'; 'Susan Lorence'; 'Hines, LeiLani'; 'Terry Wicks'; 'Benventano, Dan'; 'john_sheehan@frontiercorp.com'; 'Wayne Hart'; Johnson, Bonnie J.; Powers, F. Lynne; Stichter, Kathleen L.
Subject: Potential CMP non-compliance: unannounced Qwest technician work at CLEC customer premise

Judy:

On the Re-Design call, you indicated that we should bring issues of potential non-compliance with the CMP process to you. Below is a description of a situation that appears to be an example of Qwest non-compliance with CMP. If Qwest is commencing or revising a process to have Qwest technicians at CLEC end-user customer premises, that process change affects CLECs (as described below). Qwest did not initiate a CR, however. Eschelon asks that Qwest review with CLECs the reasons why this issue was not handled as a CR. Please investigate this issue and report back to CLECs and the CMP Re-design team. Thank you,

Karen L. Clauson
[REDACTED]

Qwest has apparently commenced a project to increase copper availability (or some kind of process that results in Qwest technicians making unannounced visits to CLEC end-user customer premises). Unfortunately, Qwest has failed to coordinate adequately with CLECs to avoid service disruptions. Eschelon first learned of this situation in the context of its migration of existing customer lines to UNE-P, but the problem also occurs with conversions of new customers to CLECs using UNE-P and resale. For orders that do not otherwise generally require a dispatch (such as conversions and reuse of facilities), Qwest nonetheless dispatches a technician to change cable and pair. If Qwest apprised Eschelon of its plan to do so, Eschelon could coordinate with Qwest and set end-user customer expectations. Qwest has not done that. At a minimum, this causes customer confusion, because Eschelon has told the customer that no technician would be needed. Instead of the expected seamless conversion, a Qwest technician appears and tells Eschelon's customer that the technician is going to take down the customer's service. This is disconcerting enough for the customer. If something goes wrong, the disruption may also be prolonged. In addition, depending on the work performed by Qwest, customer premise equipment could be affected (analog versus digital, modems, equipment settings, *etc.*). Notification and coordination are needed to address these issues.

On July 2, 2002, for example, a Colorado customer was supposed to convert to Eschelon. The order required no dispatch. But, a Qwest technician nonetheless arrived and changed a cable and pair. The Qwest technician failed to complete the cross connect

at the demarcation. Therefore, the end-user customer - an insurance company - suddenly found that it could make no calls on a business day shortly before a holiday weekend. As of the afternoon of July 3, 2002, the customer could still make no calls. Qwest told Eschelon that it had tagged the lines at the demarcation, so Eschelon could dispatch a technician to fix the problem. Although Qwest created the service disruption, Eschelon went ahead and dispatched a technician to get the customer back in service. This should have been Qwest's responsibility.

When Qwest begins a project such as the apparent project to increase copper availability, Qwest should provide adequate notice to CLECs and coordinate with them to avoid service disruptions. Also, Qwest should not be able to impose extra work and costs on CLECs to complete and correct work that Qwest is performing on its own. The orders placed by Eschelon did not require technical work, but Eschelon has nonetheless had to dispatch technicians or otherwise resolve these issues. Regarding the magnitude of the problem, Eschelon will not necessarily know of all of the instances when this occurs. (This may also occur, for example, when there is no order activity or trouble ticket, so Eschelon would not have any reason to believe any work was being done on the account at all.) While a Qwest dispatch may surprise and displease a customer, the customer may choose not to call Eschelon. Then, Eschelon does not even have an opportunity to explain the problem.

Karen L. Clauson
[REDACTED]

COPPERMAX

-----Original Message-----

From: Clauson, Karen L.
Sent: Tuesday, July 16, 2002 6:19 PM
To: Schultz, Judy
Cc: Matt White; Jim Maher; Bahner, Terry; Balvin, Liz; Clauson, Karen; Crain, Andrew; Dixon, Tom; Doberneck, Megan; Green, Wendy; Gunderson, Peder; Heline, Mark; Hydock, Mike; Jacobs, Teresa; Jennings-Fader, Mana; Lee, Judy; Lees, Marcia; Littler, Bill; McDaniel, Paul; Menezes, Mitch; Nolan, Laurel; Osborne-Miller, Donna; Powers, Lynne; Prescott, Deborah; Priday, Tom; Quintana, Becky; Rossi, Matt; Routh, Mark; Spence, Barbara; Stichter, Kathy; Thompson, Jeffery; Travis, Susan; VanMeter, Sharon; Woodcock, Beth; Zulevic, Mike; Baum, Carol; Susan Lorence; Hines, LeiLani; Terry Wicks; Benventano, Dan; john_sheehan@frontiercorp.com; Wayne Hart; Johnson, Bonnie J.; Powers, F. Lynne; Stichter, Kathleen L.
Subject: FW: Potential CMP non-compliance: Network Updates: Announcements: GN: CopperMax UNE Testing Mtg, Effective Immediately
Importance: High

Judy:

On the Re-Design call, you indicated that we should bring issues of potential non-compliance with the CMP process to you. In the email below, Michael Zulevic of Covad has raised issues relating to the "CopperMax deployment" with CMP. In addition to the issues raised by Covad, Eschelon would add a request that Qwest review with CLECs the reasons why this issue was not handled as a CR. It appears to be non-compliance with the established process and we would request that you investigate this compliance issue and report back to CLECs and the CMP Re-design team.

Thank you,

Karen L. Clauson
[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Zulevic [SMTP: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2002 3:04 PM
To: Michael Buck; [REDACTED]
Cc: Wayne Hart; [REDACTED]; Benventano, Dan; Terry Wicks; Hines, LeiLani; Susan Lorence; Baum, Carol; Zulevic, Mike; Woodcock, Beth; VanMeter, Sharon; Travis, Susan; Thompson, Jeffery; Stichter, Kathy; Spence, Barbara; Schultz, Judy; Routh, Mark; Rossi, Matt; Quintana, Becky; Priday, Tom; Prescott, Deborah; Powers, Lynne; Osborne-Miller, Donna; Nolan, Laurel; Menezes, Mitch; McDaniel, Paul; Littler, Bill; Lees, Marcia; Lee, Judy; Jennings-Fader, Mana; Jacobs, Teresa; Hydock, Mike; Heline, Mark; Gunderson, Peder; Green, Wendy; Doberneck, Megan; Dixon, Tom; Crain, Andrew; Clauson, Karen; Balvin, Liz; Bahner, Terry; Jim Maher
Subject: FW: Network Updates: Announcements: GN: CopperMax UNE Testing Mtg, Effective Immediately
Importance: High

Craig,

After participating in your conference call July 12, 2002 on the CopperMax deployment and discussing the "pros and cons" internally at Covad, I have come to the conclusion that many questions remain unanswered and that no deployment on Covad UNE loops should take place until we are satisfied that the deployment is in the best interest of Covad. Covad is officially requesting that your planned deployment on Aug. 1, 2002 be postponed for Covad. Further, because Covad feels this deployment can have serious impacts upon CLECs, we

are requesting that Qwest bring this deployment plan to Change Management as a Level 4 change request until the full impacts are totally understood by the CLEC community and we have agreed to the benefit of the deployment. The following are some of the concerns identified by Covad:

-ADDED COMPLEXITY DUE TO ADDITIONAL CROSS-CONNECTS REQUIRED

-ADDED "POTENTIAL" FAILURE POINTS DUE TO CROSS-CONNECTS

-ADDED "POTENTIAL" FAILURE POINTS DUE TO TEST EQUIPMENT IN CIRCUIT

-COPPERMAX TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS HAVE NOT YET BEEN MADE AVAILABLE TO CLEC COMMUNITY

-"ADVANTAGES" TO CLECS HAS NOT BEEN QUANTIFIED OR CLEARLY IDENTIFIED

-COVAD CURRENTLY HAS SIMILAR COLLOCATED TEST EQUIPMENT DEPLOYED ON UNE LOOPS AND HAS PROVIDED QWEST TECHNICIANS WITH REMOTE TEST ACCESS TO THIS EQUIPMENT (IVR) FOR PROVISIONING AND TROUBLE ISOLATION

-NO ASSURANCES OF ADVERSE INTERACTION BETWEEN COPPERMAX AND COVAD TEST EQUIPMENT

-ADDITIONAL LOOP LENGTH CREATED BY ADDING COPPERMAX TO THE CIRCUITS

-NO ASSURANCES RELATED TO FUTURE COST RECOVERY EFFORTS BY QWEST

-RETAIL PARITY ISSUES RELATED TO SOME OF THE ABOVE

Given that Covad's UNE loop provisioning and trouble isolation issues are much less significant than those associated with line shared orders, Covad does not want to take a chance of experiencing greater problems with our UNE loop services, as some of the issues above are significant for line shared orders. Again, Covad does NOT wish to have any of it's UNE orders connected to the CopperMax until we are sure that we will benefit from this new capability.

Michael Zulevic
Dir.- External Affairs/Operations
Covad Communications
[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: mailouts@qwest.com [<mailto:mailouts@qwest.com>]

Sent: Friday, June 28, 2002 12:39 PM

To: mzulevic[REDACTED]

Subject: Network Updates: Announcements: GN: CopperMax UNE Testing Mtg,
Effective Immediately

LSR REJECTS

-----Original Message-----

From: Clauson, Karen L.
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2002 10:35 AM
To: 'Jim Maher'; Bahner, Terry; Balvin, Liz; Clauson, Karen L.; Crain, Andrew; Dixon, Tom; Doberneck, Megan; Green, Wendy; Gunderson, Peder; Heline, Mark; Hydock, Mike; Jacobs, Teresa; Jennings-Fader, Mana; Lee, Judy; Lees, Marcia; Littler, Bill; McDaniel, Paul; Menezes, Mitch; Nolan, Laurel; Osborne-Miller, Donna; Powers, F. Lynne; Prescott, Deborah; Priday, Tom; Quintana, Becky; Rossi, Matt; Routh, Mark; Schultz, Judy; Spence, Barbara; Stichter, Kathleen L.; Thompson, Jeffery; Travis, Susan; VanMeter, Sharon; Woodcock, Beth; Zulevic, Mike; Baum, Carol; Susan Lorence; Hines, LeiLani; Terry Wicks; Benventano, Dan; john_sheehan@frontiercorp.com; Wayne Hart; becky.oliver@wcom.com; bcarias@nightfire.com; White, Matt
Subject: FW: LSR Rejects PON: UNEPAZ5JGS207772 VER: - compliance issue/process changes needed

Here is another example of the situation that Eschelon has been raising in CMP and Redesign for some time. Qwest CMP and regulatory folks claim to have a process, but its operational personnel are unfamiliar with the process. Eschelon has to provide evidence of the process to Qwest operational reps to try to convince them that there is a process before there is any possibility of taking advantage of the process. Given that this remains a problem after CLECs have raised this issue for a long period of time, Bonnie's suggestion for addressing the issue is a particularly good one. CRs should not be closed until it is confirmed that the appropriate documentation is in place (in the PCAT or as otherwise appropriate on the web) to show that the process has changed. Redesign should also adopt Bonnie's suggestion that a review be conducted of CRs closed to date to ensure that each change has been properly documented in a place where CLECs can readily find it and be able to refer to it in these situations.

-----Original Message-----

From: Johnson, Bonnie J.
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2002 10:02 AM
To: mjbuck@qwest.com
Cc: Clauson, Karen L.; Stichter, Kathleen L.; Powers, F. Lynne; Johnson, Bonnie J.; jmschu4@qwest.com
Subject: FW: FW: LSR Rejects PON: UNEPAZ5JGS207772 VER:

Michael,

I would like to open an action item for next months meeting. On several occasions, Eschelon has expressed the concern that MCC's are not an effective tool of communication. Eschelon has spent 3 days working on a reject in error because a process was defined in CMP, however, that process was never posted on the Wholesale web site. As a result Eschelon is forced to communicate the information to Qwest. This is time consuming and unnecessary for both Qwest and the CLEC.

On a going forward basis, Eschelon will not close any CR's until the Qwest web site is updated with the appropriate process information, where it is appropriate to have the information documented. In addition, I would like to recommend we review all closed process CR's and ensure the information is documented for the CLEC's to refer to.

Thanks in advance for your help,

Bonnie Johnson
612 436-6218

-----Original Message-----

From: Johnson, Bonnie J.
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2002 9:40 AM
To: jlnovak@qwest.com
Cc: Johnson, Bonnie J.
Subject: FW: FW: LSR Rejects PON: UNEPAZ5JGS207772 VER:

Jean,

It is my understanding the Mpls Center is still refusing to work the LSR associated with this issue. The CMP documentation on the process for correcting a CSR is located at

http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/downloads/2002/020723/CLEC_Change_RequestProductProcess_Archive_Reports.pdf

It is CR 5608163. If I had the MCC number I would provide that as well. I will be bringing this issue to Michael Buck at CMP to determine why the process they spelled out is not documented.

My expectation is that Eschelon will receive an FOC on this LSR by the 1PM call today.

Thanks,

Bonnie

-----Original Message-----

From: Johnson, Bonnie J.
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2002 7:52 AM
To: jlnovak@qwest.com
Cc: Johnson, Bonnie J.; Roney, Cynthia M.; Pries, Dave W.
Subject: FW: FW: LSR Rejects PON: UNEPAZ5JGS207772 VER:

Jean,

This was a CMP documented process. CLEC's have the choice of opening a ticket or identifying the changes on the LSR and set it to manual handling. Please advise the CSIE of this process. It was communicated via MCC.

Ken has background as well if need be.

Thanks,
Bonnie

RAW LOOP DATA

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Zulevic [SMTP:mzulevic@Covad.COM]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2002 1:06 PM
To: Judith Schultz; Michael Buck
Cc: Mindy Cutcher; Sandy Caron; Sheila Hoffman; Tom Dixon; Terry Wicks; Teresa L (Terry) Bahner; Susan Travis; Sharon K Van Meter; Powers, F. Lynne; Mitch Menezes; Megan Doberneck; Marcia Lees; Liz Balvin; LeiLani Hines; Karen Clauson; Bill Littler; Donna Osborne-Miller; Kathleen L. Stichter
Subject: FW: Systems Update: IMA EDI & GUI: GN: IMA Raw Loop Data Query Update, Effective Immediately
Importance: High

Judi and Michael,

After checking with those in Covad who use this information, it is clear that internal training will need to take place based upon this change. Immediate implementation for this is not appropriate. It very well may be a positive change, but we must be able to prepare for it. Covad requests that this change be given at least a Level 1 so that we have an opportunity to conduct the needed training and get more information on the reason for the change.

Thanks,

Mike Z.

Michael Zulevic
Dir.- External Affairs/Operations
Covad Communications
Office(520)575-2776
Cel(303)884-5657
Fax (520)575-2785

-----Original Message-----

From: mailouts@qwest.com [<mailto:mailouts@qwest.com>]
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2002 3:23 PM
To: mzulevic@Covad.COM
Subject: Systems Update: IMA EDI & GUI: GN: IMA Raw Loop Data Query Update, Effective Immediately



ContactMailAttach.htm

-----Original Message-----

From: Johnson, Bonnie J.
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2002 8:33 AM
To: 'jmschu4@qwest.com'; 'mjibuck@qwest.com'
Cc: Clauson, Karen L.
Subject: FW: Systems Update: IMA EDI & GUI: GN: IMA Raw Loop Data Query Update, Effective Immediately

Judy and Michael,

This notification is describing changes to the appearance of data now located in the raw loop data information. Eschelon has employees interpreting this data and will require a change in documentation and training. There is no level on this.

Please advise.

Bonnie Johnson

-----Original Message-----

From: mailouts@qwest.com [SMTP:mailouts@qwest.com]
<[mailto:\[SMTP:mailouts@qwest.com\]](mailto:[SMTP:mailouts@qwest.com])>
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2002 5:23 PM
To: bjjohnson@eschelon.com
Subject: Systems Update: IMA EDI & GUI: GN: IMA Raw Loop Data Query Update, Effective Immediately



ContactMailAttach.htm